



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,708	02/15/2002	Satish K. Sharma	6322.N	1808
25533	7590	02/06/2004		
PHARMACIA & UPJOHN 301 HENRIETTA ST 0228-32-LAW KALAMAZOO, MI 49007			EXAMINER CHERNYSHEV, OLGA N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/076,708

Applicant(s)

SHARMA ET AL.

Examiner

Olga N. Chernyshev

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper filed October 27, 2003 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claims 1-4 are related as genus and species and, therefore, should not be restricted. Applicant's arguments are found to be persuasive and restriction requirement has been reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-20 are under examination in the instant office action.

Sequence compliance

2. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.821 through 1.825. Specifically, no sequence listing has been provided which includes the amino acid sequence presented in line 7 on page 7 of the instant specification. In case this sequence is new, Applicant needs to provide a substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of a "Sequence Listing" which includes all of the sequences that are present in the instant application and encompassed by these rules, a substitute paper copy of that "Sequence Listing", an amendment directing the entry of that paper copy into the specification, and a statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d). The instant specification will also need to be amended so that it complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.821(d)

Art Unit: 1646

which requires a reference to a particular sequence identifier (SEQ ID NO:) be made in the specification and claims wherever a reference is made to that sequence. For rules interpretation Applicant may call (703) 308-1123. See M.P.E.P. 2422.04.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed February 03, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. In the instant case it appears that no copies of the documents cited in PTO-1449 form submitted on February 03, 2003 have been provided. Applicant is advised that IDS has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the last sentence does not end with a period, therefore, it appears that the text of the abstract is not fully finished. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

5. Claims 2-9, 12, 16 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims do not end with a period. See MPEP 608.01(m) Form of Claims

The claim or claims must commence on a separate sheet and should appear after the detailed description of the invention. While there is no set statutory form for claims, the present Office practice is to insist that each claim must be the object of a sentence starting with "I (or we) claim," "The invention claimed is" (or the equivalent). If, at the time of allowance, the quoted terminology is not present, it is inserted by the Technology Center (TC) technical support staff. Each claim begins with a capital letter and ends with a period. Periods may not be used elsewhere in the claims except for abbreviations. See *Fressola v. Manbeck*, 36 USPQ2d 1211 (D.D.C. 1995).
Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

6. Claims 5-8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 9.

When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). In the instant case, claims 5-8 recite different fragments of beta amyloid peptide of SEQ ID NO: 7, which is a 43-amino acid long peptide of a define structure. Therefore, due to the use of comprising language, claim 9, which recites beta-amyloid peptide comprising full length of SEQ ID NO: 7, encompasses the same subject matter as claims 5-9, which recite peptides comprising shorter fragments of the same beta-amyloid peptide of SEQ ID NO: 7.

7. Claim 18 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 17.
When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim

Art Unit: 1646

to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP

§ 706.03(k). In the instant case claim 18 is a duplicate of claim 17.

8. Claim 19 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 20.

When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP

§ 706.03(k). In the instant case claim 19 recites a limitation “polypeptide is labeled” and claim 20 recites a limitation “polypeptide comprises a tag”, which appears to be encompassing the same subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for *in vitro* cell-free method for identifying agents that are inhibitors for tau-beta amyloid complex formation, does not reasonably provide enablement for practicing such method *in vivo* or *in vitro* using cell cultures, for example. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 1-20 are directed to a method for identifying agents that are inhibitors of tau-beta amyloid complex formation by contacting tau protein and an aggregated beta-amyloid peptide in

Art Unit: 1646

the presence and absence of a test agent. Thus, the claims, as written, broadly encompass practicing such method under any condition including *in vivo* conditions as well as *in vitro* settings within cell culture environment, for example. However, the instant specification fails to provide enough guidance for one skilled in the art on how to practice the full scope of the claimed method, thereby requiring undue experimentation to discover how to use Applicant's invention, as currently claimed.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art and, (8) the breadth of the claims. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d, 1400 (CAFC 1988).

The nature of the invention is the demonstration that incubation of aggregated beta-amyloid protein and purified or recombinant tau protein *in vitro* promotes tau aggregation (see Examples on pages 13-21 of the instant specification). It is well recognized in the art that beta amyloid protein and tau protein are the major components of amyloid plaques and neurofibrillary tangles (NFT), respectively, which are two key hallmarks of brain pathology associated with Alzheimer's disease. Note that although the tau-beta amyloid protein complex is not limited to an *in vitro* formed aggregate, with regard to claim breadth, the standard under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, entails the determination of what the claims recite and what the claims mean as a whole. In addition, when analyzing the enablement scope of the claims, the teachings of the specification are to be taken into account because the claims are to be given their broadest

Art Unit: 1646

reasonable interpretation that is consistent with the specification. As such, the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed method is such that it allows to form a tau-beta amyloid protein complex *in vivo* within a whole organism body as well as *in vitro* within a cell, and then assess the inhibitory action of a test agent according to the claimed method steps. However, the instant specification, as filed, clearly fails to provide any guidance or supporting working examples on how to practice the full scope of the claimed method.

While the skill level in the art is high, the level of predictability is low. It is not clear and not explained in the instant specification, how to contact a tau polypeptide, an aggregated beta-amyloid peptide and a test agent (see step (a) of claim 1) in a cell, for example. The sole working examples in the specification, as originally filed, pertain to the incubation of samples of tau and beta-amyloid proteins followed by the analysis of an aggregated pellet. While it is not necessary that Applicant understands or discloses the mechanism by which the invention functions, in this case, in the absence of such an understanding, no extrapolation can be made of the results of experiments using tau and beta amyloid proteins as chemical reagents to other natural conditions, in which these proteins occur and function.

A patent is granted for a completed invention, not the general suggestion of an idea and how that idea might be developed into the claimed invention. In the decision of *Genentec, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ 2d 100, (CAFC 1997), the court held that:

“[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable” and that “[t]ossing out the mere germ of an idea does not constitute enabling disclosure”. The court further stated that “when there is no disclosure of any specific starting material or of any of the conditions under which a

Art Unit: 1646

process is to be carried out, undue experimentation is required; there is a failure to meet the enablement requirements that cannot be rectified by asserting that all the disclosure related to the process is within the skill of the art”, “[i]t is the specification, not the knowledge of one skilled in the art, that must supply the novel aspects of an invention in order to constitute adequate enablement”.

The instant specification is not enabling because one can not following the guidance presented therein and practice the claimed method without first making a substantial inventive contribution.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 is vague and indefinite for recitation of “beta-amyloid peptide comprising residues 1-43 of SEQ ID NO: 7”, emphasis added. According to the art-accepted definition and also the definition presented in the instant specification (see page 8, starting at line 20), beta-amyloid peptide is a 43 amino acid long polypeptide of a defined structure, SEQ ID NO: 7 in the instant case. Therefore, it is not clear and cannot be determined from the claim or the instant specification what molecular embodiment of beta-amyloid peptide is intended by the claim. Clarification is required.

Conclusion

11. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga N. Chernyshev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9 AM to 5 PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax center located in Crystal Mall 1 (CM1). The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by Applicant or Applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 872-9306. If this number is out of service, please call the Group receptionist for an alternative number. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (571) 273-0870. Official papers should NOT be faxed to (571) 273-0870.

Art Unit: 1646

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Olga N. Chernyshev, Ph.D. 